

007 12 1918  
UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY

# De-Prussianizing the Soul of Germany

---

Being an Address Made by Joseph Buffington

Senior United States Circuit Judge

to

The Chamber of Commerce of the City of Buffalo  
January 8, 1918

---

Now Reprinted for General Circulation by

The Patriotic League of Americans of German Origin  
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Additional Copies of this Pamphlet can be procured for 10  
cents a copy (\$1.00 a dozen) by addressing

**PATRIOTIC LEAGUE OF AMERICANS OF GERMAN ORIGIN**

George Seibel, Secretary,

516 Grant Street,

Pittsburgh, Pa.

## FOREWORD

---

George Washington was born under the British flag. His name was English. Every drop of blood in his veins was English. The village church where his people had worshiped was in England. The graveyard where his forebears were buried was in England. He got his military training with the British troops. His house was called for the British Admiral Vernon. He was a communicant of the Church of England. His whole life was in touch with his motherland.

There came a time in George Washington's life when the Declaration of Independence called on him to turn his back on the British king, of whom he was a subject. Read that Declaration yourself. It was a personal charge against George III. It said, "The history of the present king of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations." It recited twenty-seven wrongs, and alleged they were King George's personal acts, and ended by saying that "a prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people."

Because of these wrongs by Britain's ruler, George Washington took the painful course of turning his back on the country of his ancestors. If he had not done so, we should have had no country and no flag.

And it is just because the overwhelming majority of loyal Americans of German ancestry, here in Pennsylvania, have in this great world war done in 1917 the same thing George Washington did in 1776, and have loyally and wholeheartedly turned from the heritage of their birth and race to the flag and country of America, that I am glad to comply with their request to print and give general circulation to this Buffalo Chamber of Commerce address, "De-Prussianizing the Soul of Germany." And in complying with this request, I wish to record my testimony to the one hundred per cent. loyalty of the vast, vast majority of my fellow Americans of German descent. Their patriotism has been put to a higher test than that of most others, for their American loyalty is based on breaking the ties of race and homeland. I know of no higher type of American patriotism than that of Philadelphia's great mayor, my friend, the late Rudolf Blankenburg, who with his fellows of German-American birth in Phila-



delphia came to my back to a man when I was asked to mobilize men of foreign birth to the support of the last Liberty Loan. The fact that they led all other races, the ten millions of bonds those Philadelphia German-Americans took and hold, was more of a blow to Kaiserism and more of an assurance to thoughtful Americans, than the loud abuse heaped on the German-American by that type of noisy patriots who feel they emphasize their own patriotism by questioning the patriotism of others.

My reader, let me add this: if you find anything in this address that deepens your conviction of America's profound righteousness in this war, anything that strengthens your stern determination to put an end to the Prussian military system, you owe it to my fellow Americans of German lineage. From my fellow native-born Americans have come many letters, words, advice, and urgings that this address be published. When representative men of German lineage read it in manuscript, they have just gone to work and printed it. I believe in this practical efficiency of the German mind when directed along patriotic American lines. My countrymen in this crucial time let us in 1918 wisely mobilize, crystallize, and vitalize that great reservoir of devotion to liberty and to the American Union that made Carl Schurz, Franz Sigel, and thousands of others of Americans of German lineage, a decisive factor, if not indeed the decisive factor, in saving our country in 1861-65 from disunion, and so prevented government of the people, by the people, and for the people, from perishing from the earth.

JOSEPH BUFFINGTON.



## De-Prussianizing the Soul of Germany

---

We have sixty rules in our court; fifty-nine I seldom remember, one I never forget. That unforgettable one constrains counsel, no matter how huge the record, to print in few words the question on which the case turns. So, in sensing to-night the crux of the world cause that is being physically fought on battlefields and spiritually tried in nations' souls, I will lay down these two basic propositions: First, the cause of this world war was the Prussianizing of the soul of Germany; second, the only escape from another world war is the de-Prussianizing of that soul.

To these two simple propositions my every word to-night is addressed with the hope of deepening in you that other simple and logical conviction that is finding lasting lodgment in American hearts and brains, namely, that there is nothing else to do but to clean up this Prussianism, once and for all. This jaw-set conviction of the nation has taken practical shape in the millions of khaki-clad Americans who, sounding forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat, in deep, stern undertones voice the decision of a nation's soul:

"We're going over, we're going over,  
And we won't come back till it's over, over there."

That war, as Sherman said, is hell, and that we all hate it, are mere truisms; but to say that because war is a hated hell we can get rid of it, is as foolish as to assert that the devil can be put out of business because we hate evil. We can lessen the likelihood of war; we can at times avert it; but until human selfishness stops, wars will not stop. The absolute stoppage of war is as visionary as the stoppage of poverty. But, while we cannot wholly eliminate war, nations may refuse to wage it for any but unselfish national purposes. It follows, therefore, that wars may be of two sorts, those of selfish aggression or those of unselfish principle. Indeed, the same war may, on the one side, be an unrighteous one of aggression, and on the other a righteous defense of great principles. For the acid test of war is not the outward and visible thing, the battlefield, the hospital, the grave—but the real crux, war's low hellishness or its lofty nobility, is the purpose and spirit with which a nation fights.

I have no use for either the war-lords who hold every war to be right or for the peace-lords who hold any war to be wrong. They both represent extreme pendulum swings. The war-lord has such deep but selfish national convictions that he has no regard for humanity generally. The peace-lord, or pacifist, has such a thin-spread sentimentalism for humanity in the abstract, that he has no practical national patriotism in

the concrete. Indeed, in the final analysis war-lord and pacifist logically land at the same goal; the war-lord and his war-nation by the ruthless road of international anarchy, the pacifist and his people by the smooth path of intranational anarchy.\*

But, whether the goal be anarchy or slavery matters little, for as of old the earth in either case would be "without form and void, and darkness upon the face of the deep." The truth lies, as always, between these two extremes, and consists in the blend of deep national convictions with a due regard for humanity generally. When Grant said, "I propose to fight it out on this line if it takes all summer," it was the war-lord spirit of national unselfish conviction that saved the Union. When he said, "Let us have peace," it was the peace-lord spirit of regard for humanity that made a rebirth of the Union.

What is a war of aggression? What is a war of principle? Let us answer these questions by a review of our own history. In 1806, Napoleon Bonaparte, to prevent the Mississippi valley falling into the hands of Great Britain, hurriedly sold it to the United States. As the great northern section of the Louisiana Purchase, in the forty years following, filled with northern immigration and northern thought, and rounded out from Minnesota to Washington and Oregon, the country began to think of extending our southern states also to the Pacific. This was intensified by the South itself desiring to carry slavery westward. So, between our envious eyes on our neighbor's land, the weakness of Mexico's situation from her troubles with Texas, and the movement to extend slavery, the United States began its first and last war of selfish aggression.

Look at it—a strong democracy, striking a weak neighbor republic! We may soothe our conscience by saying the discovery of gold in California later would have filled it with men of our own breed who eventually would have taken California from Mexico. We may contend that geographically California naturally belonged to us. We may excuse ourselves because we paid Mexico ten million dollars for what we took from her, but I have yet to learn that a burglar can take my property and right the wrong by paying his own price for the loot.

Over the mantel of an old Pennsylvania country-town law office was an engraved scroll which I gazed on with childish interest, and from which later, as I studied law in that old office, I drank in a deep aversion to my country's first and last war of aggression, for the old scroll told that he whose name I was proud to bear was one of those just and far-visioned men, who by vote and voice in congressional hall recorded a protest against that Mexican war which the iner-

\*For example, the internationalist ruthlessness of the German warlord has ruined Belgium from without. The intranational pacifism of Russian theorists has ruined Russia from within.



rant pen of time and history has written down as the first and only war of selfish aggression waged by my country. And dearly have we paid for the wrong, and long will our children pay for it hereafter. In the first place, we sowed the seed of distrust of our nation in every republic in Central and South America. We convinced them that, while the Monroe Doctrine might prevent European intervention from the east, it did not prevent United States aggression from the north, and for seventy-five years it made impossible that strong, united Western Hemisphere policy of the united republics of North and South America, which I believe is going to be one of the by-products of the great war in which we are engaged. The three thousand miles between us and Canada, inviolate, unguarded, sacred, and the fifteen hundred miles between us and Mexico, now bristling with American bayonets, eighty thousand I am told, that should to-day be in France, show that nations reap as they sow, for our Mexican war made the American Gringo hated by every man, woman and child south of the Rio Grande. That heritage of deep Mexican hatred has harassed and crippled great enterprises from the United States, and will continue to do so. In our Civil War it made Mexico a natural base for European aggression when Maximilian, the Austrian, supported by Imperial Napoleon, set at naught our Monroe Doctrine and sought to transplant to the Western Hemisphere the imperial house of Hapsburg.\*

In the present war we see Germany using Mexico as a possible base for submarine supply stations, an actual base for wireless communication, and a potential base for a German invasion through our southern boundary, if German diplomacy could have seduced from us our loyal and unshakable ally, Japan. And I take this opportunity to record my belief that the underhand diplomatic policy of Germany for years has been and is now to poison Japan and the United States against each other. That German diplomacy was caught red-handed in this Mexican-Japanese invasion plan emphasizes that view. In my judgment, the commercial, governmental and cultural future of Japan and America go hand in hand. They are the logical guardians of the Pacific and the Orient, and they stand to-day shoulder to shoulder in extending across the Pacific the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine, to buttress Asia against the encroachment of European imperialism.†

\*"Some of us, if I may say so privately, look back with regret upon some of the more ancient relations that we have had with Mexico long before our generation; and America, if I may so express it, would now feel ashamed to take advantage of a neighbor."  
—President Wilson's Address to Mexican Editors, June, 1918.

†It is interesting to note that Australia is now awakening to the necessity of extending the Monroe Doctrine to the Pacific. Premier Hughes of Australia is now in the United States, urging that such action be taken. Such an extension of the Monroe Doctrine to the Pacific and the Orient will, in my judgment, ultimately be made by Japan and the United States.



There is no nation with which Japan has more in common and less in antagonism than the United States. And there is nothing that will break that relationship but unwise, unwarranted and unnational state legislation on race prohibition and race selective lines. While no judge should commit himself judicially in advance on any legal question, I can tell you in strict personal confidence that any counsel who seeks to convince one particular judge that any one single state can pass a law which shall nullify the treaty-making power of forty-seven other United States, will have resting on him a burden of proof not less than 47 to 1. And I want to say further, that in the anxious months now on us and ahead of us, if the line of Britain and France, which has saved us forty months, were by some great catastrophe to crumble, it is a comfort to feel that unnumbered thousands of Japanese would cross the seas and our continent in time to meet the black Prussian eagle on the Atlantic coast. I believe Japan prefers the straight and narrow path across our continent, and standing at our back, to the round-about way suggested by Ambassador Bernstorff's diplomacy of Japan coming through Mexico, and stabbing us in the back. No—we made our mistake with Mexico—but from Commodore Perry's time down until we on American soil settled the Russo-Japanese war, we have had the respect, the confidence, and the friendship of Nippon.\*

From our Mexican war of aggression, with its seventy-five years of lamentable fruitage and those never-ending Mexican troubles, which we must take up anew when the world-war is over, let us turn to our Spanish-American war, a war of principle, one of the noblest, most unselfish pages in any nation's history. That war opened a new era of national disinterestedness. It brought humanity, philanthropy, and the Golden Rule into the diplomacy of nations, and began a big-brother internationalism as righteous as it was novel. Time does not permit a summary of the historic justifications of that war. Suffice it to say that three hundred years of Spain's misrule, the continuous revolutions and turmoil in Cuba at our very door, the concentration camps of Weyler, the utter inability of old-world Spain to adjust its rule to the new-world spirit, all culminating finally in the sinking of the Maine, united to

\*I venture to think that Japan's deeper community of interest with the United States than with any other nation is the crux of our future with Japan. The Japanese Embassy wrote me: "Permit me to say that you have struck the right note when you said that 'There is no nation with which Japan has more in common and less in antagonism than the United States.' This simple passage, to say nothing of the rest, will go a long way to remove the scales from the eyes of many doubting Thomases."

And Mr. Morris, our Ambassador to Japan, wrote me that the portion of this Buffalo address, with reference to Japan, was printed with approval generally in the press of Japan.

draw us into an unsought and unselfish war, a war not of territorial aggression, but of territorial surrender, a war based on the slowly reached conviction that this Spanish business too had to be cleaned up once and for all.

Being unsought and unselfish, the Spanish-American war brought a richer fruitage of blessing than ever fell to any other nation's lot. But the faultfinder says, "You took Spain's lands from her." Yes, we did, but we used the lands we took as trustees for the world at large. Let me make that very clear. No richer prize ever fell to a victor than Cuba. Fertile lands, inexhaustible mines, a people anxious to join our great republic. No nation ever had a better excuse for keeping a war-prize than the United States had in Cuba. But what we did was the noblest and the most novel thing in national unselfishness. The diplomatic world was startled when, instead of exacting indemnity, we paid Spain \$50,000,000 for what we took, and was then given another diplomatic jolt when we gave back to Cuba the Cuba we had taken, bought, and paid for. In effect, we said, "We are trustees for democracy," and we gave Cuba to her own people for self-government, for home rule, for western hemisphere democracy.

That gift marked the advent of the Golden Rule in international morals. And when the little republic found the problem too great—for self-government, my friends, is not an automatic governmental panacea, as Russia shows, but a problem to be patiently worked out by men schooled in self-control—when little Cuba stumbled and fell in her effort, and there was every justification for us to take and hold Cuba, we lifted up the stumbling little republic and started it anew. And, by way of parenthesis, I want to bespeak yet again from the American people that same Cuban patience for Russia, our friend and ally. Let us remember it took us six years after Yorktown to get our constitution. I have faith in a nation that burned its own capital to defeat the war-lord Napoleon, and a century later gave up vodka in a night to enable it to fight another war-lord. Russia has the ideal of self-government, and the common sense of the people will in the end prevail.

No wonder the nations of the world sensed our national unselfishness. When we gave and thereafter re-gave Cuba to her own people, we then and there won for the United States an arbitration standing of international fairness that subsequently enabled a President of the United States, on American soil, to persuade Russia and Japan to lay aside the big stick of war and hearken to the still voice of peace. The Nobel prize of peace would never have been awarded to Theodore Roosevelt, the pioneer of presidential peace-makers, had not the Spanish-American war showed America the unselfish nation and United States soil the impartial place, to make, for the



first time in history, in American history, on American soil, a just peace between the largest nation of Europe and the strongest nation of Asia. And when, a year ago this April, in that masterful summary President Wilson accepted the war Germany forced on us, nothing touched us more than the promptness with which the little bantam republic of Cuba, lining up the next day beside Uncle Sam's Eagle, in substance said, "I am not big; I have only one star; I can't help very much in this death-grapple of democracy, but such as I have give I unto thee," another fruitage of a righteous war of principle. And Brazil, and a dozen other Latin republics lining up with us also, shows that the selfishness of our Mexican war is being gradually lost sight of in the unselfishness of our Spanish-American war.

Yes, but you tell me we kept Porto Rico. True! But we kept it, too, in trust for the world. We needed Porto Rico as an outer defense to the Panama Canal. For, my friends, we dug the Panama Canal not alone for our own commercial advantage, not alone to double the efficiency of our own navy, but over and above this, we dug it as an aid to world commerce, America's contribution to the true freedom of the seas. So we kept Porto Rico to protect Panama for the benefit of the world.

Let me give you confirmation of this. Forty odd years ago President Grant, foreseeing an Isthmian canal, tried to buy the Danish Islands as an outpost. Denmark would not sell at that time, but when this war came, Denmark, with Belgium in mind, and fearing that these islands might fall into German hands, much preferred they should be used by an unselfish nation to help world commerce, rather than by a nation bent on destroying world commerce. Denmark well knew with whom she dealt—another fruitage of our Spanish-American war of principle—and she sold this sentinel of Panama to the United States.\*

But we kept the Philippines. Yes, we did, but in trust for democracy; in trust, to give them the American school teacher, Anglo-Saxon law and order, and the boon of self-government; in trust, for the ripening years to tutor the Filipino in the school of democracy; and in trust when, but not a day before, they have learned that lesson, to give the Philippines to the people of those islands for self-government, just as we have given Cuba to the Cubans. There is nothing in the history of any nation that surpasses the educational, unselfish colonial work the United States has done in the Philippines. That in itself were fruitage enough from the Spanish-American

\*The same fear of Germany's coveting her islands, Surinam and Curacao, in the West Indies, and the same willingness to have them in the hands of an unselfish nation, has shown itself by a movement in Holland to sell Surinam and Curacao to the United States.



war, but Providence, as it seems to me, has a way of giving to unselfish men and to unselfish nations full measure, pressed down, running over. And so it came about that when European statesmen, fearful, as we shall hereafter see, of Germany's plans to absorb China, were moved to unite in dismembering that helpless old pacifist land, so that Germany might not absorb it wholly as she was then doing in part, the Philippine Islands gave to the United States a military and naval base which enabled the United States to say, China shall not be portioned out. And the logical sequence of our Spanish-American war was a China preserved, not only to her own people, but to democracy. For when later, to the astonishment of the world, China threw aside four thousand years of imperial autocracy for the sisterhood of democracy, the student of history saw it was a by-product of our Spanish-American war. And I may say, in passing, that the revolution this past year in China, and the attempt to win her back to autocratic imperialism, is well understood in China to have been a propaganda subsidized by Germany. Happily, this effort of Germany has only resulted in lining up China for all time in the world-family of democracy, with American Anglo-Saxon ideals of government and liberty.

Time will not permit an analysis of our other wars. Our revolution, a war of principle, waged to gain democracy for ourselves; our war of 1812, fought for the democracy of the sea, the real freedom of the seas for neutrals for which we are now contending; our civil war, accepted to save democracy from itself and maintain democracy's right to self-perpetuation. Each of these was a war, not of aggression, but of principle, so that, judging our future by the acid test of our past, we see that with the exception of the Mexican war this nation has never drawn the sword as an aggressor, never save to maintain principles, never for land-lust. Such is our history's record as we strip for the strife before us.

How stands the record of the nation we face? For what have its wars been waged? Have they been wars of principle or wars of aggression?

The kingdom of Prussia was late in entering the family of great powers. She had not been a colonizing nation; the vacant spaces of the world had been largely absorbed; but for a late-comer she fared well in the acquisition of a large part of Africa and valuable strategic islands in the Pacific. It may be conceded Prussia was unfortunate in not being able to reach out and gain great colonial possessions, but she was not alone in this. Japan also was late coming into world relation. But because Prussia and Japan were late comers, affords no more ground for Prussian land aggression than for Japanese land

aggression. And the student of these two countries will see that on the one hand Japan became great, and will become greater, without land aggression, for the island of Japan is smaller than Kansas, and all her islands make her whole area a little more than half of Texas; and on the other hand, that Prussia has sadly weakened her chance to become great by her land aggression.

Indeed, the dream of any nation now to become great by land acquisition is over, because the days and dreams of world empire are a thing of the past. Great Britain holds together her far-flung colonies, not because she owns them, but because they own and control themselves. Our neighbor, Canada, is as self-governing to-day as the United States, for all practical purposes. It is this non-interfering motherhood of Britain's colonial policy, incomprehensible to Prussian military absolutism, that brought every colonial daughter to the side of the mother by the seven seas.\* Indeed, if Germany had been able to crush our unprepared allies in this unlooked-for war, and had taken Britain's great colonies from her, she could never have permanently held these far-off lands as part of the Hohenzollern empire save by the iron heel and the mailed fist of military absolutism. To maintain world sway Germany must extend Prussian militarism wherever she goes. Germany has not that genius for colonization that both Rome and England have had in a preeminent degree, and, moreover, the day for the imperial control of world-wide possessions by autocracy is over. Four centuries ago Spain held a world-wide domain. Portugal had a world-wide empire. A century ago Napoleon held half a dozen European nations. But they all failed to hold them as world freedom grew apace. The time is against a world-wide war government, and for the twentieth century a Prussianized world control could only be

\*The Kaiser has lately said that the present war is a contest between Germany's ideals and Anglo-Saxon ideals. That is true, and nowhere are those ideals more sharply contrasted than in the treatment of colonies and dependencies. The Anglo-Saxon is shown, for example, by America in the Philippines, and by Britain in India. According to the Kaiser's ideals, the colony is exploited for the benefit of the Fatherland, and its revenues and wealth are to be taken back to Germany. The Kaiser drew this contrast sharply in his compact with the business leaders of Germany in 1912-1913, told of in the pamphlet of August Thyssen. In describing the meeting between the Kaiser and these business men, Herr Thyssen, who was then Germany's leading steel manufacturer, says: "The Emperor was particularly enthusiastic over the coming German conquest of India. 'India,' he said, 'is occupied by the English, but it is by no means completely governed by them. We shall not merely occupy India—we shall conquer it, and the vast revenues that the British allowed to be taken by Indian Princes will, after our conquest, flow in a golden stream into the Fatherland.'" It is no wonder that in this war these Indian princes have loyally volunteered their wealth to support the Allies, and that India has sent a million volunteers to fight for colonial liberty.



dreamed of in the brain of an autocratic kaiser of Hohenzollern feudalism, a doting emperor of medieval Hapsburg Austrianism, or an allied sultan of Mohammedan absolutism. Had the dreams of these three kindred spirits of hereditary absolutism ever materialized, they would have repeated the experience of him who built his foundations on sand, and when the rain and storm came, great would have been the fall thereof.

Having, however, formed this impossible dream of world domination, Prussia had for forty years, in school, church and home, studiously inoculated it into the German mind, heart and soul, and night and day it has been as subtly preparing a war to make that world-dream a reality. In other words, these forty years have been spent in Prussianizing the soul of Germany.

And now let history review the wars Prussia has waged on her neighbors for territorial aggression as steps leading up to world control. There is a type of men that seeks the weakest opponent and plans the time to attack when no one can come to the weakling's rescue. That this was Prussia's policy is not a matter of conjecture, but of history. We here pause to say that for the fountain-head of modern Prussianism we turn to Otto von Bismarck. The emperors, war lords, crown princes, and kaisers that have since come and are now on the stage are but the by-products of Bismarck's brain, from the William to whom Bismarck gave the crown at Versailles, down to the kaiser who turned his back on the old Prussian monarch-maker and announced, "I received this crown from God's hand and from none other." In spite of such self-complacent talk, the world and history know that the maker of the body and the creator of the soul of modern Germany was Otto von Bismarck, the Prussian. In order, therefore, to know Germany, we turn to Bismarck, its builder and maker, and see the foundation he laid when the kaiser, not yet having received his crown from on high, was in swaddling clothes in the cradle.

In 1864, shortly before Prussia's war with Denmark, Bismarck was brutally frank in announcing war as the cornerstone of Prussian aggression, when he wrote: "War alone can solve the Danish question in a sense favorable to us; provocation to such a war can be found at any moment in which our relation to the great powers is favorable for military operations." It will thus be seen that, at this early day, Prussia showed her capacity to have, first, an excuse for war always ready; second, to spring the attack when no great power could come to the relief of her helpless quarry. And 1864 was such a time. America was then in the Civil War, while Great Britain and Russia, in strained relations, each saw the possibility of being drawn into it. Indeed, Russia had a fleet



in American waters and France had her hands full with Maximilian in Mexico. The Danish war was short, sharp and decisive, for Austria, too, helped Prussia and shared the spoils. By October, 1864, Denmark gave up three provinces. Attention should here be called to the fact that Prussia at this time was a novice in the possible by-products of war. She took only land this time, and had not yet learned the levying of tribute money on her helpless victim.

Two years passed and Austria, who helped Prussia loot Denmark, found to her sorrow that the adage of "Honor among thieves" did not apply in Prussia, for in the summer of 1866 Austria found herself the helpless victim in Prussia's second war of land piracy, for Prussia must extend her boundaries to the south. With the defeat of the Austrians at Sadowa, Austria surrendered to Prussia her claim to Danish Schleswig-Holstein, ceded some 30,000 square miles of territory, and for the first time Prussia fleshed her war-teeth in tribute money by exacting \$15,000,000 from Austria to recoup war costs.

Prussia next turned her attention to France, whose ore and coal supplies were absolutely necessary to Prussia's formed plan of world dominion. The vital significance of the Franco-Prussian war will be apparent when we consider that of the 19,000,000 tons of Germany's steel production, with which she is fighting this war, about 7,000,000 come from the land taken from France in 1870, an object lesson of what should be done by the American army on the Alsace sector to stop the possibility of another world war for our children.\* A Franco-Prussian war was easily precipitated by Bismarck through a cunningly falsified telegram, and France became the third victim of Prussian rapacity, and was forced to yield Alsace and Lorraine. To gorge Prussia's now whetted appetite for indemnity, France had to pay in three years \$1,000,000,000 to recoup Prussia for the war, part of which indemnity was kept in the identical coin at Potsdam to keep before the German nation the next war against France.

It needs no imagination to picture, after such dealing with these three neighbors, the fear and anxiety with which

\*The restoration of Alsace-Lorraine is one of the vital things in this war. Germany held these lands for forty-six years, and she used their resources to prepare for this war. Her trusteeship of these lands has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. Moreover, the Alsace sector is now held by American troops. With the advance of our army, our American dead will be buried in Alsace and Lorraine. We can rest assured that those American dead will never be left in an Alsace and Lorraine under the Kaiser's ruthless rule.

"Rest on, ennobled, sainted dead!  
Dear as the blood ye gave;  
No impious footsteps here shall tread  
The herbage of your grave."

Germany's neighbors—Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Norway and Sweden—regarded her. That Switzerland, Holland, and Scandinavia have all kept their armies mobilized at tremendous expense during this war bears witness that Germany is regarded by her neighbors as a war menace, and has put this great war burden on these neutral neighbor nations, taken these neutral peoples from the field, the factory, the mine; made vast expense for them, cut down their food, and in general brought the scourge of war upon these innocent countries. When we add to this indictment the stern fact that little Norway, a neutral nation, has had over seven hundred ships sunk and a thousand of her seamen drowned by Germany, we can readily understand that the spirit of Attila, the Hun, who gained the title of the Scourge of God, is reincarnated in the Kaiser.

And this utter disregard of the rights of these neighbor nations was what Germany's statesmen, her pastors, her teachers, were preaching to the oncoming generation as a God-given right, and thereby they were Prussianizing the German mind of Bavaria, Wuerttemberg, Saxony, and other parts of Germany. For that is one of the subtle changes that has been coming over the South German mind. The type of German who came to America before the seventies hated Prussianism as he hated poison. By the inoculation of prussic acid in the last forty years the parts of Germany that refused to bow the knee to the Baal of Prussianism have been subtly brought to fall down and worship the Prussianism which their fathers hated.

Here, in 1870, we leave Prussia, gluttoned with land conquest at the expense of her weaker neighbors, and preparing for the world onslaught of August, 1914. But pending this forty-year period, there is one incident that should not be overlooked, for it shows the spirit of Prussianism was as acute as ever during the years the world slumbered and slept, supposing Germany was now bent on the peaceful pursuits of commerce.

We have spoken heretofore of the purpose of European powers to dismember China, and of the Philippines as being the territorial base which enabled the United States to thwart that plan and save China for Anglo-Saxon democracy. That Germany had it in view herself to acquire the Philippines as a base of oriental domination is well known. It is no secret that, had we lost two or three of our large war vessels in the earlier part of the Spanish-American war, Germany would have come out openly and fought on the side of Spain. Instead of this she schemed secretly, and Admiral Dewey's memoirs made very plain the hostile attitude of the German fleet at Manila; Admiral Diedrichs lining up the German



vessels at that time with the Spanish vessels, and on the other hand Captain Chichester, of the British navy, lining up with Admiral Dewey.\*

All of this is well known to every historical student. And every jackie and officer in the American navy to-day feels that part of the shots from Uncle Sam's vessels to be made in the present war—and I have an idea that we are going to hear something from our navy this present year—are deferred payments for what Germany wanted to do in Manila Bay, where the spirit was willing, but the flesh was weak.

Our taking the Philippines thwarted Germany's Oriental plans and made it necessary for her to get some other working base. She therefore turned her attention to China, and with that scientific thoroughness and accuracy which has challenged our wonder, Germany discovered that the little port of Kiaochau was, if the least known, the best harbor China had. Back of it was Shantung, the province with the greatest possibilities of mineral development. As in the case of Denmark and France, a pretext for war was readily found. Two German priests had been murdered by Chinese outlaws. Although China offered every reparation in her power for the murder for which she was not responsible, Prussian veneration for things holy—as witness Rheims, St. Quentin and Bruges—was so deep that only land could compensate. So Kiaochou was seized in 1897 by the German navy, and China was forced to cede to Germany the harbor, extensive territorial inland grants in Shantung, and mineral and railroad rights.

The real significance of this extortion from China as a

\*"The Emperor's brother, Prince Henry, who represented his government at Hong-Kong, called on Commodore Dewey to say good-bye as the American fleet was about to leave Chinese waters for Manila. United States Consul Wildman and Captain Gridley, of the Olympia, were on the quarter-deck of the flagship in conversation with the Commodore and the Prince. The Prince said laughingly to the three, but looking Dewey in the eye: 'I will send my ships to Manila to see that you behave.' With that perfect grace and dignity for which the commodore was noted, he courteously replied: 'I shall be delighted to have you do so, Your Highness; but permit me to caution you to keep your ships from between my guns and the enemy.' The Prince saw the point, and he knew full well from that moment that George Dewey meant just what he said, and that it would not be well for anyone to interfere with him in his dealings with Spain or the Spanish fleet."—Life and Letters of Admiral Dewey.

"The English and Japanese vessels lay off Cavite, not far from the American squadron. The feeling existed on board our ship that the Germans might fire upon them—the U. S. ships—during the bombardment of the city, but if anything of the kind was contemplated—and let us presume that no such intention existed—it was perhaps blocked by the action of Captain Chichester, the senior British naval officer, in placing his command during the bombardment between them and Dewey."—Life of Admiral Robley Evans.



link in the chain of world domination became apparent in May, 1914, in which year, as I learned from personal friends in China, Germany began to build a branch of the Krupp works in China, and looted Shantung was to furnish the ores in 1917 to the Chinese Krupp works as looted Lorraine did to the Krupp works in Germany in 1870. What the Krupp works at Essen were to be in the European war, the Krupp works in China were to be in Germany's world plans in the Orient. Indeed, few people realize how great a factor this Chinese base, with 10,000 German troops constantly kept there, with a Chinese Krupp works in prospect, and with a strongly fortified and well-equipped harbor for her fleets, was to be in Germany's dream of world domination. Luckily, Japan's prompt action put an end to Germany's plan to Prussianize the Orient. Apparently, Germany felt the present war was, as we shall hereafter see, to be so short that she would have Europe helpless at her feet and that her Chinese base would not be disturbed. This view is borne out by what I learned from personal friends of the attitude of the Germans in China. When the war began and Japan moved against Kiaochou, the German population of Shantung retired to that harbor, where they remained cut off from communication with the outside world until Kiaochou surrendered to Japan that fall. When the city was taken the released Germans would not believe the German army was not in Paris, and cited to my friends the very place in France where their army was to be on each of the days they had been shut up in Kiaochou.

Let our United States Court records also speak of this exact preparedness for "the day" when Germany planned to begin the war. Hear the testimony of the captain of the Crown Princess Cecilia, when in the suit over that steamer in one of our Federal Courts, he testified:

"I was in command of the Crown Princess Cecilia since May, 1913." (Mark the date). "When I took command I was given a sealed package" (mark the designed preparedness) "and was instructed" (mark by whom: the directors of the North German Lloyd Company; like every one in Germany, they were stripped for the war Germany planned) "to open the package at any time in the future in case I received a message signed 'Siegfried' and relating to some disease. On July 31, 1914, at ten o'clock, a wireless message was brought to me. It was signed 'Siegfried.' I opened the sealed package given in May, 1913; found a code which enabled me to translate the

wireless: 'War has broken out with England, France and Russia. Turn back to New York.' \*\*\*

Going back to China, von Buelow's own words—as frank and brutal as Bismarck in the case of Denmark—show that land-lust in China, and not indemnity for the two priests, was the secret of Germany's war of oriental aggression against China. That great chancellor, in speaking of China, said, "All that we have done is to provide that, come what may, we ourselves shall not go empty-handed. The traveler cannot decide when the train is to start, but he can make sure not to miss it when it does start. The devil take the hindmost."

No; they were not to go empty-handed either to China or away from it, and the spirit of Prussian militarism was frankly and brutally outlined by the Kaiser when, addressing German troops starting to suppress the Boxer uprising against foreigners, caused in large part by this unwarranted German seizure of Kiaochow, he said: "You are to fight against a cunning, courageous, well-armed and cruel foe. When you are upon him know this—spare nobody; make no prisoners; **use your weapons in a manner to make every Chinaman for a thousand years to come forego the wish to as much as look askance at a German.**" And the world is taking William at his word.

It should here be noted, by way of contrast, that while all the allied nations that helped suppress this Boxer rebellion received indemnities—Germany about fifty million and Austria more than two—the United States declined to accept anything in excess of what she had spent on the Peking expedition, and that excess she returned to China for use in sending students to America to be educated—another evidence of our refusal to wage war for piratical profit.

Looking at this picture of these successive wars of ruthless aggression, the European German, the American German propagandist, the semi-traitorous pacifist may say, "Have you

\*The testimony in full in this case, and the proceedings generally will be found in *The Kronprinzessin Caecilie*, 228 Federal Reporter, 946: the same, 238 Federal Reporter, 668 and 244, U. S. 20. It is well to bear in mind the statement in Thyssen's pamphlet: "When the Hohenzollerns wanted to get the support of the commercial class for their war plan, they put their ideas before us as a business proposition. A large number of business and commercial men were asked to support the Hohenzollern war policy on the ground that it would pay them to do so. Let me frankly confess that I am one of those who were led to agree to support the Hohenzollern war plan when this appeal was made to the leading business men of Germany in 1912-13." Bearing this in mind, we can rest assured that the directors of the North German Lloyd line would be among the leading business men of Germany, who Thyssen says were present at that meeting, and no doubt the code referred to by Captain Polack in his testimony was prepared by this steamship company as a result of that war plan meeting in 1912.



not pictured it too black?" and my reply is: "I have not painted it black. I have only used the brush history put into my hand. The paint was furnished by a Prussianized Germany."\*

Turning from these fruits of Prussian land-lust to the years that followed 1870, when the acquisition of her neighbor's lands placed her in the group of the strong nations of the world, Germany now justifies her entrance into the present war on the ground that she was denied the right of international development and the world-wide freedom of the seas. Let us examine this claim. For my part, I have never been able to discover what was meant by that mysterious phrase, heard at times in the mouths of German world imperialists, American pacifists, and that type of American public men who love to mouth high-sounding phrases, "the freedom of the seas!" What is it when put into simple English but the right of peaceful vessels to make port and trade wherever they desire to go. Was Germany ever denied that right? When and where? No man can point to any denial to her of any such right.

Who that has stood before the great map of the Hamburg-American line in its home city, Hamburg, but has been fascinated by those tiny flags, changed from day to day, showing that the German vessel, the German flag, the German merchant, were pushing an aggressive campaign of commerce into every harbor of the world. Who could watch that great kaleidoscopic map and doubt that it was Germany that was having, gaining, holding the freedom of the seas for her people, through these great steamship lines? Who could have stood in the great hall of the Maritime Exposition at Berlin in 1906, and grasped the amazing strides of the German ship-builder, and taken in the deep significance of that world-wide sea-free sentiment of the Kaiser, "Our future is on the water," and not felt that Germany had the freedom of the seas, and that no nation was taking more commercial advantages of that absolute sea freedom than Germany.

As I stood in Hamburg and saw what German fleets were

\*As the years go on and every German feels the heavy burden of race humiliation which the Kaiser and his advisers have laid on German blood, German speech, and German folk, I believe the Kaiser, his offspring and his advisers, will be anathema maranatha to people of German lineage. Thus, referring to a circular issued by the German Trade Department to the business men of Germany, in reference to after-war trade, and advising them to "employ agents who pass as French or English, preferably, or as Dutch, American or Spanish," Herr Thyssen says, "The meaning of this circular in plain language is this: So loathed and hated have Germans become outside their own country, that no one will want to have any personal dealings with them after the war." At whose door does the guilt for this rest? There is but one answer: the Kaiser who said "Use your weapons in a manner to make every Chinaman for a thousand years to come forego the wish to as much as look askance at a German."



doing, how they were making England's Southampton a port of call, and undermining the great English lines; as I saw the free trade policy of England gave Germany free trade on free seas to Great Britain herself, and the same access to Britain's colonies that America and Norway and every other nation enjoyed; as I saw these great fleets of the German leviathans of commerce, with their great government subsidies, and contrasted our dwindling American merchant marine, denied subsidies and throttled to the death by hostile legislation, I could not but feel that in truth Germany's future, as the Kaiser said, was on the sea, and our future was off it. And I could not but sense with keen irony what must have been in the mind of the managers of those transatlantic German lines when they considerately gave their great vessels the names of our Washington and our Lincoln and our Grant. They might do it then, but never again shall those great American names be used to mark a vessel built by a nation that unfurled the black flag of the pirate over Lusitania-sinking U-boats.\*

German traders and salesmen and ships were everywhere in the world. Freights brought from all parts of the globe came to Hamburg and Bremen, and from there went north and south by subsidiary German lines to the Russian end of the Baltic and the Turkish end of the Mediterranean. I found flour sent from America for the Scotch market was first brought to Hamburg and transhipped back to Scotland. Our consul general in India told me that when the war was started the great leather and hide trade of India was so monopolized

\*Germany's toll against the commerce of neutral nations from August, 1914, to April 26, 1917, was 849 neutral sunken ships, apportioned as follows: America, 20 ships; Argentina, 1; Brazil, 2; Denmark, 114; Greece, 60; Holland, 76; Norway and Sweden, 537; Spain (Germany's best friend), 35; Peru, 6; Uruguay, 1. But not only has the U-boat horror proved a failure, but Great Britain has actually raised and salvaged more than 600 of her own torpedoed vessels. This summary of sunken neutral vessels is taken from records in the Carnegie Library, Pittsburgh, Pa. An analysis of this list shows me that in vessel destruction Germany has acted with deliberate ruthlessness against neutral nations. Knowing she herself would be short of vessels at the end of the war, Germany has evidently planned to sink the vessels of neutral Scandinavia, so that the latter would have no maritime advantage over Germany when peace came. In my judgment, one of the stern retributive conditions of a righteous peace for which America should stand, must be, that while refusing to accept any indemnity from Germany for our own 20 vessels, but compensating their owners ourselves, we see to it that Germany pays all these other and smaller nations for every one of the vessels of these neutral nations Germany sank. This could be practically worked out by establishing an International Court or Tribunal before which the claims of these neutral nations and vessel owners against Germany for these vessels could be determined. Such a tribunal will be an object lesson to Germany of the real rights of neutrals in time of war. Let us bear in mind that unless we then take this step to protect these small nations against Germany, her ruthless destruction of these neutral vessels will never be made good.

by German houses that there was but one British house left in Calcutta. When this war began, Canada, our own country, and I believe every commercial country was flooded with "made-in-Germany" goods, and we stood aghast as we realized how world-wide Germany's commerce had grown and how dependent upon it we were for many things. Never have I been so impressed with commercial power as when I stood in the great Bourse at Hamburg at the noon hour, and saw gathered there four thousand of the strongest commercial faces I have ever seen, and I realized that on that floor one could buy or sell, in any part of the world, anything that was made or produced in any part of the globe. The Hamburg Bourse was the acme of the catholicity of commerce—German commerce—German freedom of the seas—and the traders of Germany could say to its master-spirit, "Both our present and our future are on the sea." As I pictured that great bourse hall, I can imagine those great commercial captains of Germany whispering to themselves, for they dared not ask it aloud in that "Verboten" land, "Could we not in the twenty years to come, could we not have conquered the world by commerce on the sea, instead of our military system destroying commerce by a war under the sea?"

No, if the German people had only known it, their future was **on the sea**, not **under the sea**. They were beating, out-distancing, out-trading the Lusitania on the sea. It were wiser to let the Lusitania float than to have her from ocean depths, night and day, chant a *De Profundis* to God and humanity. "Out of the depths I have called unto Thee, oh Lord; Oh Lord, hear my voice." The Lusitania's flag is furled; her eleven hundred murdered are silent, many of them my countrymen; her 235 women and children, many of them my fellow Americans, but, thank God, when the U-boat, directed from the war office in Berlin and the German embassy at Washington, for I do not blame the U-boat men who simply did what they were told to do by the great spirits of Prussianism, I thank God that when Prussianized seamen, by the direction of Prussianized statesmen, left American women and children to their fate, there was a breed of men who stood by and had rather go to the depths of the sea for eternity than for one instant close their ears to that world cry, never denied, that insistent call of helplessness, "Women and children first."

"When the seas demand their tribute, and a British ship goes down,

There is something in the English after all.

There's no panic rush for safety, where the weak are left to drown,

For there's something in the English after all;

But the women and the children are the first to leave the wreck,

With the crew in hand as steady as a wall,

And the captain is the last to stand upon the sinking deck;—

Yes, there's something in the English, after all."



To say that because England had the greatest fleets—warlike and commercial—Germany was denied the freedom of the seas, or freedom of commerce, is simply not true. Little Holland, in spite of Britain's fleets, built her fleets and acquired great foreign trade. Small Norway developed a greater freight vessel capacity than any nation in the world except Britain, so large that in this war she could lose four hundred Norwegian vessels and have a thousand Norwegian and Swedish sailors drowned by German submarines. Restricted Japan found no closure of the sea when she developed her great maritime fleets, and thanks to LaFollette and his bill, for the noble senator seems to have been pro-Japanese as well as pro-German—emasculated our Pacific steamship lines. Countries of small area like Holland, Japan and Norway, did develop great fleets, and for a big nation like Germany to say that Britain has denied it the freedom of the seas is to play the baby or to admit they are a lesser breed than Norway, Japan and Holland grow. In fact, no one can fairly look at the tremendous commercial growth of Germany when she began this war, and not be convinced that Germany had commercial freedom everywhere; that her trade was world-wide and was growing more so; that if she had simply gone ahead for the next forty years as she had for the last forty years, she would have been the peace-lord of the world and have had the globe commercially and industrially at her feet.

Why, then, has Germany thrown all this to the wind? In my judgment, simply because, casting aside its commercial common sense—for there is no abler trader than the old-time German—and obsessed and Prussianized by the military spirit, Germany lost her head and thought by one short, sharp, decisive campaign she could leap into that world dominion which she had been falsely for forty years taught was to be her war-won due.\*

For Germany was eating, sleeping, living in the war spirit, in hate, in the certainty of the war. The four million of spick and span new gray-and-green uniforms handed to the German army when the call to the colors came would convict any nation of war malice aforethought without any other evidence. Well do I remember how ten years ago when I heard a German friend, whose whole future was as bound up in peace as my own, in the presence of his wife and children, with a fierceness I had never dreamed was smouldering in his heart,

\*Indeed, that Germany generally expected the world conquest would be completed by 1915, is evidenced by the fact that the business men of Germany who were promised lands and privileges in Australia, India and Canada, expected to get them by 1915. This is set forth by Thyssen: "According to the promises of the Hohenzollern, victory was to have been achieved in December, 1915, and the promises made to myself and other commercial men in Germany when our money for the Kaiser's war chest was wanted, were to have been then redeemed."



say to his ten-year-old boy: "Little Hermann isht for the navy. He will grow up to fight de damn Britisher." And when I saw that message was the daily teaching of the German home, that neither the gentle mother nor the little sister nor the boy looked up in surprise, I realized that the German mind was being Prussianized for war, and I came away with foreboding in my heart.

Why did Germany throw all her trade and commercial vantage-ground to the wind? To verify the old adage, "Him whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad"? For it all seemed so clear to the German mind that with her tremendous military preparation and with all the other nations unprepared, the dream of world-conquest could be swiftly realized. As she knew, and the sequel proved, England was wholly unprepared, and, of course, as Germany reasoned, Britain could not and would not enter the war. No one was left but France and slow-moving Russia. It was all clear. A swift rush through Belgium, a tiger leap on France, and with France crushed and the Belgian and French coast, within a ferry distance of England, held by Germany, she could attend to England at her leisure, or pounce on her if she or her colonies began to prepare. With France crushed, Germany could sweep down on Russia and crush her, as she afterward did—what then was left? England at her mercy, Canada liable to be turned into a Prussian province,\* and Mexico and its unsettled state and its outrages on German citizens, a sufficient pretext for getting a Mexican-German base, what was to prevent Germany working her will on unprepared America? For with America unprepared, a German Mexico on the south, with the United States honeycombed with German sympathizers, the occupation of America and her release for a huge indemnity were but matters of time and detail. In our American self-sufficiency this may have been an idle dream a few weeks ago, but a frightful possibility to-night if Britain and France fail to hold until we mobilize and prepare, but the German people believed this dream a possibility in 1914, and they are nearer the reality in 1918 than in 1914.

What wonder it swept a Prussianized Germany off its feet, this practical, possible and real plan of world-conquest? That it was regarded as possible, a million mounds somewhere in France bear mute testimony—those with the iron cross above testifying that the rank and file of Germany felt it could be done, and those under white crosses—then our pro-

\*Thyssen says: "A syndicate was formed for the exploitation of Canada. This syndicate consisted of the heads of twelve great firms; the working capital was fixed at £20,000,000, half of which was to be found by the German government. \* \* \* These promises were not vaguely given. They were made definitely on behalf of the Emperor to gatherings of business men \* \* \* and all particulars of these promises were entered in a book at the Trades Department."

tectors, thank God, now our loyal allies, who gave their lives to end for all time this Prussian dream.\*

In utterly subordinating the individuality of the citizen in the absolutism of the state, as the Prussian military system makes the citizens do, and in the citizen loyally joining in such subordination, as the Prussianized German citizen does, we can understand that if the state is itself a ruthless military system the individual becomes a mere spoke in the military machine. When this war broke out, we who had been in German homes and knew the German people, could not at first understand how the ruthless things could be done that were done. But as the action of the soldier "depends on what the lieutenant says," as the loyal Irishman told the Sinn Feiners, we see how the man who shells the hospital, the man who girdles the fruit-tree, the man who shells the cathedral, the man who dungs the well, the boy who mans the U-boat, the man who helped murder the Lusitania's victims, he was not the man whom we had known; that man has surrendered his Prussianized soul to the wishes, the orders, the ideals of the state, and the state was the military ideal which had Prussianized Germany. And that they had done so is proved by the fact that a united Germany to-day stands back of and justifies the crimes of the Prussian system.

How has this been done? I think history, divine history, affords a reasonable explanation. The Bible tells us that the Almighty, in working out the problem of a state, made choice of a chosen people, for there can be no question of the selection of the Jewish race as the chosen people, and of its complete separation physically, spiritually, mentally, and residually from the rest of humanity. The world divided into two groups—Jew and Gentile. The Jew was God-chosen—ueber allés, superman—his nationality, its exclusiveness, its superiority, became the obsession of his soul.

For reasons I have not time here to discuss, this God-chosen Hebrew people failed in the experiment of

\*This is no eleventh-hour hysterical war view. On February 22, 1916, in an address to Americans of Foreign Birth, made at Soldiers' Memorial Hall, Pittsburgh, I said: "The tendency of democracy is to widen its sphere by reason; of autocracy, to extend itself by force. France is to-day a republic, in my judgment, very largely because several thousand French soldiers spent several years on this side of the Atlantic in our Revolutionary struggle, and with La Fayette took back to France the spirit of Washington and our patriotic fathers. The success of democracy may perchance be regarded as a danger to autocracy, \* \* \* and if that menace of American democracy to European autocracy becomes too acute, and prepared autocracy sees in unprepared democracy a menace to the continuance and justification of autocracy, there will be nothing to preserve on the American hemisphere a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, save the outer wall of a prepared American navy, the inner wall of a prepared American army, and the vision of American leaders who have, with timely forethought, prepared to make the Monroe Doctrine a defended truth."



one race being supermen, "ueber alles," and if such was the result of the frailties of human nature working on a people chosen by God, what was bound to come to a people who chose themselves to be the chosen people, supermen, "ueber alles," and who welded themselves into a Deutschland ueber alles? The chosen of God, Hebrew, and the chosen of self, Prussian, were both bound to break down when they became obsessed with the mania of race-superiority. No people have stood or can stand that strain when it once obsesses their soul.

So long as that superman superiority confined itself to German territory, the world was willing to smile and let it go on, but when it ruthlessly crossed the borders of Belgium and began to push everyone else off the earth, and then to drive even neutrals from the sea, and to act on the theory that there was no right that could withstand might, and that Prussian right was Prussian might, the world sternly took up the Prussian challenge and there will be no laying down of arms until the Prussianized mind and heart and soul become de-Prussianized and the Prussianized German becomes what he was in ante-Prussian days, in his ante-superman days, the days before he was "ueber alles," when the German was a good neighbor, a loyal friend, and when his head was unswollen with Prussian self-sufficiency.

Listen to what der Kaiser, der Kriegsherr, the war-lord himself says, and this stuff has been what has been Prussianizing Germany:

"The Germans are the salt of the earth; they will fulfill their destiny, which is to rule the world. The German people will be the rock of granite upon which our Lord God can build and complete His work of Kultur in the world. God has called us Germans to kulturize the world; we are the missionaries of human progress. Our God would never have taken such pains with our German fatherland and its people if He had not been preparing us for something still greater."

Can we imagine any people in America, can we imagine even pacifists swallowing this? And yet the soul of Germany has been so Prussianized that brave men, misguided men, have swallowed it and are laying down their lives to support it, and men of German blood here in America are laying aside their Americanism and have slipped into treasonable indorsement of it. And, as if this were not enough, we must have a sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of American boys over there to save the world from Prussianization.

Here is what the kaiser of a Prussianized Germany says: "I received this crown from God's hand and from none other. I hold my crown in fief of Almighty God—considering myself as the instrument of the Lord, without heeding the views and opinions of the day, I go my way. Remember that the Ger-



man people are the chosen of God. On me, on me as the German emperor, the Spirit of God has descended. I am His weapon, His sword, and His vice-regent. Woe to the disobedient. Death to cowards and disbelievers. I received this crown from God's hands and no other."

We can see how a Prussianized German, either in the line of battle or here in America, has no shame when he thinks of the broken faith with Belgium's scrap-of-paper treaty, when he accepts the Kaiser's teaching that "No mere parchment shall be interposed between God and this land." We can see how, when the Rubicon of neutral boundaries was passed and the wrong on Belgium was begun, there was no length to which every soldier would not go in carrying out in Belgium the iron policy of Prussian militarism, when he had been taught and had accepted the teaching of God's vice-regent kaiser. "It is to the empire of the world that the German genius aspires. As to war, it is a trade, in which the least scruple would spoil everything, and indeed what man of honor would ever make war if he had not the right to make rules that would authorize plunder, fire and carnage? What do we care for the rules according to which the enemy fights, if he be beaten in the fight?" They had only to substitute for China the word Belgium, and to recall those awful words, "Spare nobody; make no prisoners; use your weapons in a manner to make Chinamen for a thousand years to come forego the wish to as much as look askance at a German."

Sometimes a cartoonist can picture a world issue by a few penstrokes and a scrap of paper. One such cartoon in humor, truth, principle, and moral summarizes the spirit of a Prussianized German—world control aggression on the one side, and on the other democracy's principle of world freedom. The cartoon's time is a year ago; the place the American coast; the characters the Prussian war-lord and Uncle Sam. Pointing down to an American vessel, its sides to be painted with Prussian military precision, according to German directions, the war-lord points to the ship and says, "One day in the week you may go to Yarmouth." And the old, slow-moving, time-taking figure raises his forefinger to the level of the war-lord's face and with a set to his jaw that knows no variableness, neither shadow of turning, fastens his eye in humor, truth, principle, and moral, on this William the world-lord, while Uncle Sam looks at the flag that Decatur flew when he went to the Mediterranean a hundred years ago to clear up those Barbary pirates who also sought to throttle world commerce; the flag that Farragut followed when he said, "Damn the torpedoes; go ahead," and your Uncle Sam says to the German-Prussian war and sea lord, "Seven days in the week you can go to——," well, you remember the place to which Sherman referred.

We have not sought this war. It was designedly forced upon us. The world knows that for two weary years we tried to escape it, while Germany's firm purpose was, while dallying with us, eventually to embroil us—for she wanted a paymaster for the indemnities exacted from a beaten Europe or an unprepared America. As we bare the nation's soul, we can submit to the judgment of the world, of history, and above all to our own national conscience, that we entered this war with the highest justification, the purest principles, and the deepest unselfishness.\* God knows that this peace-loving and war-untaught American people did not welcome war. We want no indemnities. We neither covet nor desire any nation's ground, and the only ground we will get is the six feet, somewhere in France, in which to lay our dead. When we cross the seas we go in the spirit of Lincoln, when he said, "I shall do nothing in malice. What I shall deal with is too vast for malicious dealing."

Those we send know that death is now the price of freedom, and they will prize freedom more than life. We know the Via Dolorosa our allies have trod for four long years, and as we follow in their train we know that we too will now find the Golgotha and Calvary that for four years has been theirs. We know that from this side of the sea will come an innumerable throng whose unselfish devotion to right will serve to swell that bivouac of the dead, those allied graves, those immortals of world freedom, Belgian, French, British, Serbian, Russian, Italian, Rumanian, Greek, and Portuguese. And as we link our own in the months to come with those who have already made the supreme sacrifice to right, let us reverently salute the dying and the dead, and, thanking God for their courage and devotion, resolve in His name that we shall not leave their work unfinished or suffer their sacrifices to have been made in vain. And because their sacrificial graves are the awful price the world had to pay for Prussianizing the German soul, and because an awakened world now knows that until the German soul purges itself of the dross of Prussianism Germany can only offer or make a Prussian peace, and because the world knows that a Prussian peace has in the past and will in the future only mean time to prepare for war, therefore I submit to you that the verdict of the world is, and of right ought to be,

\*"I look forward with pride to the time which I hope will come when we can give substantial evidence, not only that we do not want anything out of this war, but that we would not accept anything out of it; that it is absolutely a case of disinterested action, and if you will watch the attitude of our people, you will see nothing that stirs them so deeply as the assurance that this war, so far as we are concerned, is for idealistic objects."—President Wilson's Address to Mexican Editors, June, 1918.



that Germany must put an end to Prussianism from within, or the world must put an end to Prussianism from without.\* So

"We're going over, we're going over,

And we won't come back till it's over, over there."

\*Has this De-Prussianizing of the Soul of Germany from within begun? It seems to me it has. Repentance is the first step toward regeneration. Can Germany's sin in bringing on this war be more penitently confessed than by Prince Lichnowsky, the Ambassador of Germany to Great Britain, who in summing it up in "My Mission to London," says: "Such was the end of my London mission. It was wrecked, not by the perfidy of the British, but by the perfidy of our policy. \* \* \* I had to support in London a policy the heresy of which I recognized. That brought down vengeance on me because it was a sin against the Holy Ghost."

To this may be added the statement of Dr. Muehlton, Director of the Krupp Works, in his letter of May 7, 1917, to Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg; printed in Current History, May, 1918, page 32: "The deportation of Belgians, the systematic destruction in France and the torpedoing of English hospital ships, have so degraded the governors of the German Empire, that I am profoundly convinced that they are disqualified forever for the elaboration of a sincere and just agreement. The personalities may change, but they cannot remain the representatives of the German cause. The German people will not be able to repair the grievous crimes committed against its own present and future, and against that of Europe and the whole human race, until it is represented by different men with a different mentality. To tell the truth, it is mere justice that its reputation throughout the whole world is as bad as it is. The triumph of its methods—the methods by which it has hitherto conducted the war, both militarily and politically—would constitute a defeat for the ideals and the supreme hopes of mankind."



## THYSSEN'S PAMPHLET.

When my address was delivered at Buffalo I was still under the impression, then generally held, that the Kaiser and the Prussian military system alone had brought about this war, and that the German business men had been unfortunate victims of it as they stood by and saw their business ruined. As the truth has leaked out, we now find that the business leaders of Germany were co-conspirators, and that they, for their own gain, deliberately joined in 1912 with the Kaiser in planning this war for the purpose of gain and world dominion, and that their hands and souls are as deeply dyed in the blood of this war as are the Kaiser's and the General Staff's. That the Kaiser should call the leading men of the nation together, that he should unfold this plan of conquest, and that they should unite in causing this war, is a state of affairs so awful, so cold-blooded, so hellish—I use that word advisedly—that it has no parallel in history. That this was done is shown by the pamphlet of August Thyssen, which is here printed in full as an appendix. That pamphlet should be read in every American home. It is printed in the Congressional Record, Vol. 56, No. 37, page 1591. Its authenticity may be questioned; but, tested by the standards of evidence, I am satisfied of its truth, therefore I use it as such. Its significance lies not alone in the crime it discloses, but in the fact that the criminal shows neither recognition of the crime nor repentance for it. The disclosures of August Thyssen are not a confession of his crime, but a complaint of the Kaiser's failure to carry out his part of the crime, to end the war in 1915 and to deliver to Thyssen and his co-conspirators the lands and benefits the Kaiser promised in 1912. The pamphlet and Thyssen's attitude show the German mind has neither recognized nor repented of the world crime it committed. It shows that Germany's soul is still Prussianized, and that after the sacrifice of the blood of millions of the Allies, the blood of thousands and thousands of our best of America must go to the altar before the soul of Germany is cleansed. Who was Thyssen? The leading business man of Germany. His pamphlet was written for circulation among the business men of Germany, but it fell into other hands. Once the cat was out of the bag, it was wiser for the German authorities to let it run than to raise a hue and cry to stop it. Thyssen is seventy-five years of age. His business has been taken from him. To crush him further would only be for the Imperial government to put the stamp of authenticity on this pamphlet. Who Thyssen was, his relation to the Kaiser, and his position in Germany is evidenced in the book "Men around the Kaiser," published before the war. From that work I quote: "There have been many makers of modern Germany. Their identities and personalities, with rare exceptions, have escaped notice abroad amid the paeans of praise so indiscriminately showered upon the gifted Kaiser. To sketch the careers and characters of some of these latter-day Teutonic knights is the purpose of this volume. \* \* \* By universal consent August Thyssen is the dominating figure of the Fatherland's throbbing industrial life. No one's life-story so typifies the new Germany's fabulous rise to power and wealth in the interval since the Franco-Prussian war." Let us hear this man's own words:

### WHAT THYSSEN SAYS.

I am writing this pamphlet because I want to open the eyes of Germans, especially of the business community, to facts. When the Hohenzollerns wanted to get the support of the commercial class for their war plans, they put their ideas before us as a business proposition. A large number of business and commercial men were asked to support the Hohenzollern war policy on the ground that

it would pay to do so. Let me frankly confess that I am one of those who were led to agree to support the Hohenzollern war plan when this appeal was made to the leading business men of Germany in 1912-1913. I was led to do so, however, against my better judgment.

In 1912 the Hohenzollerns saw that the war had become a necessity to the preservation of the military system, upon which their power depends. In that year the Hohenzollerns might have directed, if they had desired, the foreign affairs of our country so that peace would have been assured in Europe for at least fifty years. But prolonged peace would have resulted certainly in the breakup of our military system, and with the breakup of our military system the power of the Hohenzollerns would come to an end. The emperor and his family, as I said, clearly understood this, and they therefore, in 1912, decided to embark on a great war of conquest.

But to do this they had to get the commercial community to support them in their aims. They did this by holding out to them hopes of great personal gain as a result of the war. In the light of events that have taken place since August, 1914, these promises now appear supremely ridiculous, but most of us at the time were led to believe that they would probably be realized.

### PROMISES OF VAST CONQUEST.

I was personally promised a free grant of 30,000 acres in Australia and a loan from the Deutsche Bank of £150,000, at 3 per cent., to enable me to develop my business in Australia. Several other firms were promised special trading facilities in India, which was to be conquered by Germany, be it noted, by the end of 1915. A syndicate was formed for the exploitation of Canada. This syndicate consisted of the heads of twelve great firms; the working capital was fixed at £20,000,000, half of which was to be found by the German government.

There were, I have heard, promises of a more personal character. For example, the "conquest of England" was to be made the occasion of bestowing upon certain favored and wealthy men some of the most desirable residences in England, but of this I have no actual proof.

Every trade and interest was appealed to. Huge indemnities were, of course, to be levied on the conquered nations, and the fortunate German manufacturers were, by this means, practically to be relieved of taxation for years after the war.

These promises were not vaguely given. They were made definitely by Bethmann-Hollweg on behalf of the emperor to gatherings of business men, and in many cases to individuals. I have mentioned the promise of a grant of 30,000 acres in Australia that was made to me. Promises of a similar kind were made to at least eighty other persons at special interviews with the chancellor, and all particulars of these promises were entered in a book at the Trades Department.

But not only were these promises made by the chancellor; they were confirmed by the emperor, who, on three occasions, addressed large private gatherings of business men in Berlin, Munich, and Cassel in 1912 and 1913. I was at one of these gatherings. The emperor's speech was one of the most flowery orations I have listened to, and so profuse were the promises he made that were even half of what he promised to be fulfilled, most of the commercial men in Germany would become rich beyond the dreams of avarice.

The emperor was particularly enthusiastic over the coming German conquest of India. "India," he said, "is occupied by the British. It is in a way governed by the British, but it is by no means completely governed by them. We shall not merely occupy India. We shall conquer it, and the vast revenues that the British



allow to be taken by Indian princes will, after in a golden stream into the Fatherland. In all the earth the German flag will fly over every of them. Finally the emperor concluded:

"I am making you no promises that can not be redeemed if you are now prepare offices which are necessary to secure the position must and shall occupy in the world. He who remains a traitor to the Fatherland; he who helps willingly will have rich reward."

All sounded, I admit, tempting and alluring, and there were some who viewed rather dubiously the prospect of being able to conquer the world in a year, the majority of commercial men agreed to support the Hohenzollern. Most of them have since wished they had never paid attention to them.

According to the promises of the Hohenzollern, victories have been achieved in December, 1915, and the promises made by myself and other commercial men in Germany when our Kaiser's war chest was wanted were to have been their.

#### CHARGES IMPERIAL BLACKMAIL.

But this is what has happened in reality: In December the chancellor, Bethmann-Hollweg, began to have interviews more with business men. The purpose of these interviews was to get more money from them. Guarantees were asked from several five business men in Germany, including myself, that they would undertake to subscribe £200,000,000 to the next war loan. I was personally asked to guarantee a subscription of £200,000. I declined to give this guarantee; so did some others. I was then favored with a private interview with Bethmann-Hollweg's private secretary, who told me that if I declined to give the guarantee and subsequently the money I would lose on a contract I had with the War Office. But not only that—I was threatened with the practical ruin of my business if I did not give the guarantee.

I described this demand as blackmail of the worst sort and refused to guarantee a mark to the war loan. Two months later I lost my contract, and the greater part of my business has been taken over at a figure that means confiscation. Moreover, I am not to get paid until after the war, but am to receive 4 per cent. on the purchase price. Every man who declined to promise a subscription to the amount he was asked has been treated in the same manner.

The majority of men, however, preferred to pay rather than to be ruined, and so the Hohenzollerns in the main got their way. But, apart from the blackmailing of men who refused to pay any more money into the Hohenzollern war chest, let us see how the Hohenzollern's promises are working out. A circular was sent out last March to a large number of business men by the Foreign Trade Department which contained the following suggestion:

#### PREPARING FOR THE RECKONING.

"It will be wise for employers who have foreign trade interests to employ agents in foreign countries who can pass themselves off as being of French or English birth. German agents and travelers will probably for some time after the war have difficulty in doing business not only in enemy countries, but in neutral countries. There will undoubtedly be a personal prejudice against Germans that would probably make it difficult for representatives of German firms to do business. Although this prejudice will not interfere with German trade, as it will be merely of a personal character, it will facilitate trading transactions if employers will employ agents who

English, preferably, or as Dutch, American, or

prospect we are faced with after the war. The singular in plain language is this: So loathed and become outside their own country that no one may personal dealings with them after the war.

" of businesses are, moreover, being secretly state aid. A condition of this aid is that the business receiving it shall agree to accept a considerable control over their business after the war. This is a part of a plan on the part of the Hohenzollerns to get all classes thoroughly into their grip before the end and so minimize the chances of a revolution. Men who have agreed to accept aid now for their business, control after the war, have received a notification from the Trade Department to the effect that, with proper organization, they ought to recover their pre-war trade three years after peace is declared. Here is the Hohenzollern method of recovery. We are to get back our pre-war trade three years after peace is declared, and to do this we must submit to have all our transactions controlled and supervised by the state. Any German to whom such prospects are held out by the state is to see that he has been bamboozled and humbugged into supporting a war from which the utmost he can expect is to come out of it without national bankruptcy?